

REMARKS

The Examiner is thanked for the performance of a thorough search. No claims have been canceled or added in this reply. Claim 1 is amended. Hence, Claims 1-11 and 13-14 are pending in this application. All issues raised in the Office Action mailed April 14, 2009 are addressed hereinafter.

SUMMARY OF THE TELEPHONE INTERVIEW

The Examiner is thanked for granting the courtesy of a telephone interview on July 10, 2009. Examiner Moutaouakil and Applicant's representatives Edward Becker and Małgorzata Kulczycka attended the interview.

Claim 1 and the following references were discussed: *Miida*, U.S. Patent Publication No. 2002/0049839, *Lung et al.* U.S. 5,533,175 and *D'Amanddio et al.* U.S. 6,317,387. Although an agreement regarding patentability was not reached, significant progress in understanding the differences between the approach recited in Claim 1 and the cited prior art references was made.

The Applicant's representatives explained why *Miida*, *Lung* and *D'Amanddio* do not describe or suggest at least the features of "wherein the data format supported by each of the plurality of recipient devices is different than the data formats supported by the other recipient devices from the plurality of recipient devices," and "wherein the network device status data includes identification data that uniquely identifies an intended recipient device so that the report data is routed to the intended recipient device," recited Claim 1.

The Examiner indicated that the explanations are going to be taken into consideration during future office actions.

REJECTION OF CLAIMS 1-6, 8-11 AND 14 UNDER 35 U.S.C. § 103(a)

In the Office Action, Claims 1-6, 8-11 and 14 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being anticipated by *Miida*, U.S. Patent Publication No. 2002/0049839, in view of *Lung et al.* (U.S.

5,533,175) and further in view of *D'Amanddio et al.* (U.S. 6,317,387). (Office Action, page 3)

This rejection is respectfully traversed.

CLAIM 1

Present Claim 1 recites:

1. An apparatus for processing network device status data, the apparatus comprising:
a storage device comprising configuration data stored thereon, wherein the configuration data indicates both:
 - a set of recipient proprietary unencrypted data formats, wherein each of the recipient proprietary unencrypted data formats is understood by only one recipient device of a plurality of recipient devices, each of the recipient proprietary unencrypted data formats is supported only by one recipient device and not by any other recipient device of the plurality of recipient devices, and each of the recipient proprietary unencrypted data formats is different than any of recipient proprietary unencrypted data formats supported by the other recipient devices from the plurality of recipient devices, and
how to convert network device status data, received from a network device, that conforms to a first network device data format into each of the recipient proprietary unencrypted data formats supported by the plurality of recipient devices;
 - a conversion mechanism configured to
extract, from the network device status data, recipient identification data that uniquely identifies an intended recipient device of the plurality of recipient devices,
select, using the recipient identification data, a recipient proprietary unencrypted data format from the set of recipient proprietary unencrypted formats,
process the network device status data that conforms to the first network device data format, and
generate, based upon the configuration data, the recipient identification data and the network device status data, report data that conforms to the recipient proprietary unencrypted data format supported by the intended recipient device of the plurality of recipient devices, wherein the network device status data includes the identification data that uniquely identifies the intended recipient device so that the report data is routed to the intended recipient device.

Support for the amendment is provided at least in paragraphs [8], [18], [24], 27]-[28] and [32] of the applicants' specification.

The approach recited in Claim 1 provides many advantages, especially in networks containing devices from various manufacturers and serviced by various vendors. For example, as

described in applicants' specification paragraphs [5], [30] and [38], if a network device status data uniquely identifies an intended recipient of the device's report, the network device can communicate its report directly to the device's manufacturer or vendor that specializes in servicing the particular network device. This can be especially beneficial in networks that comprise devices serviced by a number of various vendors, and where matching the device status data with the correct vendor is cumbersome, unless the "network device status data includes identification data that uniquely identifies an intended recipient device so that the report data is routed to the intended recipient device," as claimed.

Furthermore, the ability to send the report data in a "format that conforms to the recipient proprietary unencrypted data format that is understood and supported only by the recipient device," as claimed, is beneficial to a vendor because it allows the vendor to receive data reports in formats that are proprietary to the vendor's recipient device, and that is not supported by any other recipient, vendor, competitor, etc.

Claim 1 recites one or more features that are not described or suggested in *Miida*, *Lung*, and *D'Amanddio*, individually or in combination. For example, *Miida*, *Lung*, and *D'Amanddio*, individually or in combination, fail to describe or suggest a **"set of recipient proprietary unencrypted data formats**, wherein each of the recipient proprietary unencrypted data formats is understood by only one recipient device of a plurality of recipient devices, each of the recipient proprietary unencrypted data formats is supported only by one recipient device and not by any other recipient device of the plurality of recipient devices, and each of the recipient proprietary unencrypted data formats is different than any of recipient proprietary unencrypted data formats supported by the other recipient devices from the plurality of recipient devices," recited in Claim 1.

MIIDA REFERENCE

In *Miida*, status information from copiers is sent to users via emails and is also available via a website, but *Miida does not maintain for each recipient device a "recipient proprietary unencrypted data format that is understood only by that recipient device, is supported only*

by that recipient device, and is different than any other data format supported by any other recipient device,” as claimed. As depicted in *Miida*’s FIG. 1, *Miida*’s processing center collects status information from copiers and provides status reports to users. (*Miida*, Para [139]) The reports are provided to the users in a form of email. Alternatively, the users can access the reports via a website. (*Miida*, paragraph [0156]) Thus, *Miida* describes only two data formats: an email and a webpage. (*Miida*, paragraph [0156]) However, neither the format of the email nor the format of the webpage is proprietary to a recipient device. In *Miida*, emails in the same format may be sent to more than one user. Furthermore, in *Miida*, more than one user may access the same webpage. (*Miida*, Para [156]) Neither the email format nor the webpage format is proprietary to a recipient device, as claimed. Neither the email format nor the webpage format is understood by only one recipient device, as claimed. Neither the email format nor the webpage format is supported only by one recipient device and not by any other recipient device, as claimed. Neither the email format nor the webpage format is different than any of recipient proprietary data format supported by any other recipient devices, as claimed.

In *Miida*, users are authenticated before they can access data reports, but authentication is not a “recipient proprietary unencrypted data format,” as claimed. In *Miida*, a manufacturer or a vendor of a copier establishes a website on the Internet through which the users and customers may access information about products and information about already purchased copiers. (*Miida*: Para [175]) Most of the pages on the websites are accessible to the public. (*Miida*: Para [175]) However, pages via which status reports from already purchased copiers are available, are accessible only to registered customers. (*Miida*: Para [175]) In *Miida*, customer’s registration requires providing an identification (ID), password, email address, etc. (*Miida*: Para [180]) Upon a successful registration, a registered customers may access the customer pages by providing a valid ID and password. (*Miida*: Para [181]) Based on the ID provided by the customer, *Miida*’s system determines which particular copier the customer is interested in and retrieves status information for the particular copier. (*Miida*: Para [184]) However, providing a user’s ID and a password is not a “recipient proprietary unencrypted data format,” recited in Claim 1. If anything, the ID and the

password are encrypted data that identifies the user, not the recipient device.

Miida's user may access the website from any recipient device. In *Miida*, the recipient device does not have a "proprietary unencrypted data format that is understood by only one recipient device of a plurality of recipient devices," as claimed. *Miida*'s recipient device does not have a "recipient proprietary unencrypted data format that is understood by one recipient device, is supported only by one recipient device, and is different than any other recipient proprietary unencrypted data format of any other recipient device," as claimed.

In *Miida*, the same communication protocols are used to send emails to the users and to send web pages to the users. None of *Miida*'s communications are proprietary to the recipient device. None of *Miida*'s data reports is sent in such a way that is unique to the recipient device. None of *Miida*'s data reports is sent in a "recipient proprietary unencrypted data format that only the recipient device can understand and that only the recipient device supports...," as recited in Claim 1.

DUNMORE REFERENCE

In *Dunmore*, a user defines a format in which requested data should be provided to the user; however, *Dunmore*'s does not maintain for each recipient device a "recipient proprietary unencrypted data format that is understood only by that recipient device, is supported only by that recipient device, and is different than any other data format supported by any other recipient device," as claimed. *Dunmore* describes a method and system for designing report templates that can be used to output report data. (*Dunmore*: Col. 5, ll. 38-41) The same template may be used by various users and the report data may be formatted using the same template for a number of users. (*Dunmore*: Col. 5, ll. 56-58) Therefore, *Dunmore*'s data is not send in a "recipient proprietary unencrypted data format that only the recipient device can understand and that only the recipient device supports...," as recited in Claim 1.

D'AMANDDIO

D'Amanddio describes sending data reports in various electronic formats to an end-user, but none of those formats is proprietary to the recipient's device, as claimed. In fact, *D'Amanddio*

has only one recipient device. (D'Amaddio; Col. 6, ll. 8-10) *D'Amaddio* does not have a “plurality of recipient devices,” as claimed, each of which would have had own “recipient proprietary unencrypted data format, that is understood by only that recipient device and not by any other recipient device, that is supported by only that recipient device and not by any other recipient device, and that is different than any other recipient proprietary unencrypted data formats supported by any other device,” as claimed.

Therefore, *Miida*, *Lung*, and *D'Amaddio*, individually or in combination fail to describe or suggest a **“set of recipient proprietary unencrypted data formats**, wherein each of the recipient proprietary unencrypted data formats is understood by only one recipient device of a plurality of recipient devices, each of the recipient proprietary unencrypted data formats is supported only by one recipient device and not by any other recipient device of the plurality of recipient devices, and each of the recipient proprietary unencrypted data formats is different than any of recipient proprietary unencrypted data formats supported by the other recipient devices from the plurality of recipient devices,” recited in Claim 1.

Miida, *Lung*, and *D'Amaddio*, individually or in combination, also fail to describe or suggest **“extract, from the network device status data, recipient identification data that uniquely identifies an intended recipient device** of the plurality of recipient devices, **select, using the recipient identification data**, a recipient proprietary unencrypted data format from the set of recipient proprietary unencrypted formats, ...generate, based upon the configuration data, **the recipient identification data** and the network device status data, report data that conforms to the recipient proprietary unencrypted data format supported by the intended recipient device of the plurality of recipient devices, wherein the network device status data includes the identification data that uniquely identifies the intended recipient device so that the report data is routed to the intended recipient device,” recited in Claim 1.

MIIDA REFERENCE

In *Miida*, a computer center collects and analyses information from copiers, and provides the information to the users who requested it; however, the information collected from *Miida*'s copier does not “uniquely identify an intended recipient device,” as claimed. In *Miida*, neither the collected information nor the transmission device has any knowledge about who the recipients of the status data are. In *Miida*, the information collected from the transmission devices does not “include identification data that uniquely identifies an intended recipient device so that the report data is routed to the intended recipient device,” as claimed. In contrast to *Miida*, according to Claim 1, the copier/printer/fax sends network device data that comprises the “recipient identification data.” Therefore, according to Claim 1, the copier/printer/fax selects the recipient. This capability is not described in *Miida*.

In *Miida*, authorized recipients are registered with the center, not uniquely identified by the “network device status data, received from a network device,” as claimed. In *Miida*, to access a report data, a user has to send customer-identification information to the center 100, and the center 100 has to verify whether the user is registered with the customer-ID database 22. (*Miida*, Para [181]) However, *Miida*'s copiers themselves have no reason to know user's IDs. Therefore, in *Miida*, the “network device status data” does not include “identification data that uniquely identifies an intended recipient device so that the report data is routed to the intended recipient device,” as claimed. Furthermore, *Miida* does not “select, using the recipient identification data, a recipient proprietary unencrypted data format from the set of … formats,” as claimed. Moreover, *Miida* does not “generate report data based upon the recipient identification data,” as claimed.

DUNMORE REFERENCE

In *Dunmore*, a user requests the data from the database, and defines the format in which the requested data should be provided; however, the requested data does not include “identification data that uniquely identifies an intended recipient device so that the report data is routed to

the intended recipient device,” as claimed. *Dunmore* describes a method and system for designing report templates that can be used to output report data. (Dunmore: Col. 5, ll. 38-41) When the user wishes to actually run the report, the user provides a user report request to a report generator. (Dunmore: Col. 5, ll. 56-58) Then, a report generator queries the database system, executes a query against the database and outputs the query results in the format specified by the user’s template. (Dunmore: Col. 5, ll. 56-63) However, *Dunmore*’s data in the database does not include “identification data that uniquely identifies an intended recipient device so that the report data is routed to the intended recipient device,” as claimed. Furthermore, *Dunmore* does not “select, using the recipient identification data, a recipient proprietary unencrypted data format from the set of … formats,” as claimed. Moreover, *Dunmore* does not “generate report data based upon the recipient identification data,” as claimed.

D'AMANDDIO

D'Amanddio describes sending data reports in various electronic formats to an end-user, but **none of the sources of the data can select a recipient device from a plurality of the recipient devices,” as claimed.** In *D'Amanddio*, acoustical devices collect data from an underwater apparatus system and send the data to a recipient computer. (*D'Amanddio*: Col. 6, ll. 8-10) *D'Amanddio* does not have “a plurality of recipient devices,” as claimed, each of which could be identified by a unique “recipient identification data,” as claimed. Therefore, *D'Amanddio* does not “extract, form the network device status data, recipient identification data that uniquely identifies an intended recipient device of the plurality of recipient devices,” as claimed. Furthermore, *D'Amanddio* does not “select, using the recipient identification data, a recipient proprietary unencrypted data format from the set of … formats,” as claimed. Moreover, *D'Amanddio* does not “generate report data based upon the recipient identification data,” as claimed.

In view of the foregoing, it is respectfully submitted that Claim 1 recites one or more limitations that are not taught or suggested by *Miida*, *Lung*, and *D'Amanddio*, individually or in

combination. Therefore, *Miida*, *Lung*, and *D'Amanddio*, individually or in combination, fail to teach or suggest the whole subject matter recited in Claim 1.

Reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection is respectfully requested.

CLAIMS 2-6, 8-11 AND 14

Claims 2-6, 8-11 and 14 all depend from Claim 1 and include all of the limitations of Claim 1. It is therefore respectfully submitted that Claims 2-6, 8-11 and 14 are patentable over *Miida*, *Lung*, and *D'Amanddio* for at least the reasons set forth herein with respect to Claim 1. Furthermore, it is respectfully submitted that Claims 2-6, 8-11 and 14 recite additional limitations that independently render them patentable over *Miida*, *Lung*, and *D'Amanddio*.

In view of the foregoing, it is respectfully submitted that *Miida*, *Lung*, and *D'Amanddio*, individually or in combination, fail to teach or suggests Claims 1-6, 8-11 and 14.

Reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection is respectfully requested.

REJECTION OF CLAIM 7 UNDER 35 U.S.C. § 103(a)

In the Office Action, Claim 7 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over *Miida* in view of *Lung*, further in view of *D'Amanddio* and in further view of *Krishnaprasad et al.*, U.S. Patent Publication No. 2002/0099687 (hereinafter “*Krishnaprasad*”). It is respectfully submitted that Claim 7 is patentable over *Miida*, *Lung*, *D'Amanddio* and *Krishnaprasad* for at least the reasons provided hereinafter.

Claim 7 depends from Claim 1 and includes all of the limitations of Claim 1. As previously set forth herein, Claim 1 includes one or more limitations that are not taught or suggested by *Miida*, *Lung*, and *D'Amanddio*. It is respectfully submitted that these limitations are not taught or suggested by *Krishnaprasad* and it is understood that the *Krishnaprasad* reference was not relied upon for teaching or suggesting these limitations, but rather the additional limitations of Claim 7 relating the XML schema conversion.

It is therefore respectfully submitted that Claim 7 is patentable over *Miida*, *Lung*,

D'Amanddio and *Krishnaprasad*.

Reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection is respectfully requested.

REJECTION OF CLAIM 13 UNDER 35 U.S.C. § 103(a)

In the Office Action, Claim 13 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over *Miida* in view of *Lung*, further in view of *D'Amanddio* and further in view of *McGlade*, U.S. Patent No. 6,411,598. It is respectfully submitted that Claim 13 is patentable over *Miida*, *Lung*, *D'Amanddio* and *McGlade*, considered alone or in combination, for at least the reasons provided hereinafter.

Claim 13 depends from Claim 1 and includes all of the limitations of Claim 1. As previously set forth herein, Claim 1 includes one or more limitations that are not taught or suggested by *Miida*, *Lung*, and *D'Amanddio*, individually or in combination.

Moreover, it is respectfully submitted that these limitations are not taught or suggested by *McGlade* and it is understood that the *McGlade* reference was not relied upon for teaching or suggesting these limitations, but rather the additional limitations of Claim 13 relating to providing a notification if a receipt confirmation indicating receipt of the report data is not received from a particular recipient device.

It is therefore respectfully submitted that Claim 13 is patentable over *Miida*, *Lung*, *D'Amanddio* and *McGlade*.

Reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection is respectfully requested.

CONCLUSION

It is respectfully submitted that all of the pending claims are in condition for allowance and the issuance of a notice of allowance is respectfully requested. If there are any additional fees, please charge them to Deposit Account No. 50-1302.

The Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned by telephone if the Examiner believes that such contact would be helpful in furthering the prosecution of this application.

Respectfully submitted,

HICKMAN PALERMO TRUONG & BECKER LLP

Date: August 11, 2009

/MalgorzataAKulczycka#50496/

Malgorzata A. Kulczycka

Reg. No. 50,496

2055 Gateway Place, Suite 550
San Jose, California 95110
Telephone:(408) 414-1228
Facsimile: (408) 414-1076